

MARTIN R. BADER (*Pro hac vice*)  
mbader@sheppardmullin.com  
JESSE A. SALEN (*Pro hac vice*)  
jsalen@sheppardmullin.com  
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP  
12275 El Camino Real, Suite 100  
San Diego, California 92130-4092  
Telephone: 858.720.8900

PATRICK McGILL (*Pro hac vice*)  
patrick@mcgillco.com  
MCGILL & CO., P.C.  
5580 La Jolla Blvd, Suite 39  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
Tel: (619) 974-8886

Nathan D. Thomas (USB #11965)  
Elizabeth M. Butler (USB #13658)  
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 532-1234  
nthomas@parsonsbehle.com  
lbutler@parsonsbehle.com

*Attorneys for Defendant BlendJet Inc.*

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

---

**BLENDTEC INC.**, a Utah corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**BLENDJET INC.**, a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

**DEFENDANT BLENDJET'S SHORT  
FORM MOTION TO COMPEL  
RESPONSE TO SUBPOENA TO  
MARKETSTAR**

Civil No. 2:21-cv-00668-TC-DBP

Judge Tena Campbell  
Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3) and 45(d)(2)(B) and DU CivR 37-1(b), BlendJet Inc. moves to compel the production of documents in response to the subpoena served on MarketStar QOZ Business, LLC. (Exhibit A.)

BlendJet noticed the Subpoena on December 9, 2022. (*See Exhibit B*.) Plaintiff Blendtec, Inc. served objections on December 15, 2022. (*See Exhibit C*.) The Subpoena was served on December 19, 2022. (*See Exhibit D*.) MarketStar served substantively identical objections on January 3, 2023, and thereafter confirmed that Blendtec's counsel are also representing MarketStar with respect to the Subpoena. (*See Exhibit E; Exhibit F at 2-3*.) To date, MarketStar has stood on its objections and refused to "search for and produce" any responsive documents. (Exhibit F at 1.) On February 7, 2023, BlendJet's counsel (Messrs. McGill and Salen) conferred telephonically with counsel for both MarketStar and Blendtec (Brett Foster and Tammy Kapaloski). (Exhibit G.)

There is no dispute that MarketStar possesses documentation responsive to the Subpoena. MarketStar "is a sister company of Blendtec, and both MarketStar and Blendtec are owned and controlled by Wasatch Capital." (Exhibit E at 1.) MarketStar and Blendtec share the same CEO and CFO (Keith Titus and Ben Kaufman) and the same counsel. (Exhibit C at 2; Exhibit E at 1). And Blendtec "agreed to produce emails from Mr. Titus' and Mr. Kaufman's MarketStar email accounts"– as part of its custodial ESI production. (Exhibit F at 1.) Presumably MarketStar is providing Blendtec with access to these materials, as Blendtec otherwise contends that it "does not have possession, custody, or control of Marketstar emails or other documents." (Exhibit F at 3.) But this contention contradicts MarketStar's objection that "the majority of any non-privileged documents requested in the subpoena are in the possession, custody, or control of Blendtec." (Exhibit E at 1.) Production of MarketStar documents responsive to the Subpoena is necessary to

ensure materials are not shielded from discovery merely because they are solely in the possession of MarketStar. *See, e.g., Martley v. City of Basehor, Kan.*, Case No. 19-cv-2138-DDC-GEB, 2022 WL 1302820, at \*3-4 (D. Kan. May 2, 2022) (subpoena proper “where a party [does not have] control over the requested documents that are in the possession or custody of a non-party”).

MarketStar says Blendtec has possession of responsive documents; Blendtec says it does not. One of these parties should be compelled to produce the responsive documents. If Blendtec does in fact control and produces responsive documentation, BlendJet will narrow the scope of the Requests accordingly. BlendJet is also willing to confer with MarketStar to narrow the scope of the Requests, if appropriate – but MarketStar has refused to engage in that process.

Finally, any objection by Blendtec based on a “personal right or privilege” is resolved by application of the Standard Protective Order. *See DUCivR 26-2; High Point SARL v. Sprint Nextel Corp., et al.*, Case No. 09-cv-2269-CM-DJW, 2011 WL 4008009, at \*2 (D. Kan. Sept. 9, 2011).

BlendJet requests its attorneys’ fees under FRCP 37(a)(5)(A).

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Respectfully submitted this 17<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2023.

**SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP**

Martin R. Bader (*Pro hac vice*)  
Jesse A. Salen (*Pro hac vice*)

**MCGILL & CO., P.C.**  
Patrick McGill (*pro hac vice*)

**PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER**

Nathan D. Thomas (USB #11965)  
Elizabeth M. Butler (USB #13658)

/s/ Nathan D. Thomas

*Attorneys for Defendant BlendJet, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 17th day of February, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send an electronic notification to counsel of record for all parties, including the following:

Brett Foster (#6089)  
Grant Foster (#7202)  
Tamara Kapaloski (#13471)  
**DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP**  
111 S. Main Street, Suite 2100  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone: (801) 933-7360  
Facsimile: (801) 933-7373  
foster.brett@dorsey.com  
foster.grant@dorsey.com  
kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff Blendtec, Inc.; and  
Counsel for third-party MarketStar QOZ Business, LLC*

/s/ Nathan D. Thomas